srp.

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 963 OF 2007.

Upin Ramesh Dashrath. ..Petitioner.

Versus.

The State of Maharashtra & Ors...Respondents.

S. R. Nargolkar, A.G.P. for the State.

CORAM: S. B. MHASE &
R.S.MOHITE, JJ.

DATE: APRIL 11, 2007.

P.C.

1. Counsel for the petitioner and petitioner are absent.

2. The petitioner is employee of the Maharashtra Housing & Area Development Authority (in short, "MHADA"), appointed on a compassionate basis. Father of the petitioner was also an employee of the MHADA. He was working at Aurangabad. While the father of the petitioner was working at Aurangabad, he was granted service accommodation and the said accommodation was allowed to be purchased by his father from the scheme of the MHADA. Thereafter the petitioner was appointed on compassionate ground with MHADA. Since one service accommodation has already

been granted, the MHADA thought it fit not to grant another accommodation, more specifically when he was on probation. Probationer was not entitled for any service accommodation, and he is not entitled to purchase the service accommodation as per the scheme of the MHADA. What we find is that, basically when one accommodation is made available to the petitioner's family it will be inappropriate to allow him to purchase second service accommodation. We do not find any substance in the petition. Petition is rejected.

(R.S.MOHITE, J.) **(S.B.MHASE, J.)**